

In re Patent Application of:  
**LUE CHEE LIP ET AL.**  
Serial No. **09/988,907**  
Filed: **November 20, 2001**  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

#### REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application, and for withdrawing the rejection over the Dietz et al. patent.

Dependent Claims 11, 20 and 31 have been amended to address the claim objections and the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. The arguments supporting patentability of the claims are presented in detail below.

#### I. The Claimed Invention

The present invention, as recited in independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to a method for processing a visitor request over an intranet for a visitor visiting an organization. The method comprises using the intranet within the organization for filling-out a visitor request form, submitting the filled-out visitor request form over the intranet within the organization, and creating a visitor database on the visitor based upon the filled-out visitor request form. The method further comprises transmitting a visitor approval request message via e-mail to at least one evaluator within the organization if approval is required. The visitor approval request message has a hyperlink to the filled-out visitor request form. An approval recommendation is submitted by the at least one evaluator via e-mail for updating the visitor database.

An advantage of the present invention is that the e-mail messages are easily transmitted and received over the intranet between employees within the same organization or company for processing the filled-out visitor request form. In

In re Patent Application of:  
**LUE CHEE LIP ET AL.**  
Serial No. 09/988,907  
Filed: **November 20, 2001**

---

addition, the hyperlinks embedded within the e-mail messages allow the evaluators - also within the same organization or company - to access the filled-out visitor request form to provide a user friendly and efficient method of distributing and validating the filled-out visitor request form within the same organization or company.

Independent method Claim 12 is similar to independent method Claim 1 but further recites that the visitor database includes classification of the visitor as a regular visitor or a foreign visitor, and that a visitor badge is issued based upon a validated filled-out visitor request form.

Independent device Claim 21 is directed to an intranet for processing a visitor request form and is similar to independent method Claim 1.

Independent device Claim 32 is directed to a computer-readable medium and is similar to independent method Claim 1.

## **II. The Claims Are Patentable**

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 12, 21 and 32 over the Hager et al. patent in view of the Kuzma patent. The Hager et al. patent is directed to an automation of procedures in a local area network (LAN) environment, and more particularly, the procedures are automated in a data processing system with regard to an invention disclosures stored therein.

The Examiner has taken the position that Hager et al. discloses the function of filing out a form and emailing that form to an evaluator for approval over an intranet. The Examiner further noted that Hager et al. fails to disclose the use of

In re Patent Application of:  
**LUE CHEE LIP ET AL.**  
Serial No. 09/988,907  
Filed: November 20, 2001  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

hyperlinks. The Examiner has taken official notice that it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to send a hyperlink to a document instead of an entire document, as illustrated in the Kuzma patent.

The Applicants submit that even if the references were selectively combined as suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention is still not produced. The Hager et al. patent and the Kuzma patent both fail to disclose processing a visitor request over an intranet for a visitor visiting an organization. Instead, Hager et al. discloses the automatic distribution of electronic documents, and in particular, invention disclosure documents. Kuzma discloses the transmission of electronic mail over a network. There is no mention of processing a visitor request in either the Hager et al. patent or the Kuzma patent.

In addition, Hager et al. fails to disclose that the invention disclosure is submitted over the intranet only within the organization. Reference is directed to column 5, lines 37-41 of Hager et al., which provides:

"Accordingly, the revised invention disclosure document and its associated profile/functional area identification information will thereafter be transmitted to an intellectual property law facility for further processing." (Emphasis added).

Hager et al. thus discloses that the invention disclosure is submitted within the organization, as well as to an intellectual property law facility outside the organization.

In re Patent Application of:

**LUE CHEE LIP ET AL.**

Serial No. 09/988,907

Filed: November 20, 2001

---

An advantage of the present invention is that the e-mail messages are easily transmitted and received over the intranet between employees within the same organization or company for processing the filled-out visitor request form. For security purposes, the visitor request form is submitted over the internet only within the organization. In addition, the hyperlinks embedded within the e-mail messages allow the evaluators - also within the same organization or company - to access the filled-out visitor request form to provide a user friendly and efficient method of distributing and validating the filled-out visitor request form only within the same organization or company.

Hager et al. fails to disclose that the invention disclosure is submitted only within the organization. In addition, Hager et al. and Kuzma both fail to disclose processing a visitor request over an intranet for a visitor visiting an organization.

It thus appears that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight reconstruction to modify the Hager et al. patent in view of the Kuzma patent in an attempt to produce the claimed invention. The prior art references, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest 1) processing a visitor request over an intranet for a visitor visiting an organization, including 2) submitting the filled-out visitor request form over the intranet only within the organization.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Hager et al. in view of Kuzma. Independent Claims 12, 21 and 32 are similar to independent Claim 1.

In re Patent Application of:  
**LUE CHEE LIP ET AL.**  
Serial No. 09/988,907  
Filed: November 20, 2001  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

Therefore, it is submitted that these claims are also patentable over Hager et al. in view of Kuzma. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1, 12, 21 and 32, it is submitted that their dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features of the invention, are also patentable. These dependent claims require no further discussion herein.

### III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is submitted that all of the claims are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is respectfully requested to reverse the earlier unfavorable decision by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael W. Taylor*

\_\_\_\_\_  
MICHAEL W. TAYLOR  
Reg. No. 43,182  
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath  
& Gilchrist, P.A.  
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401  
Post Office Box 3791  
Orlando, Florida 32802  
407-841-2330